

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office Action dated February 20, 2009 (hereinafter "Current Office Action"), in which the Examiner: 1) objected to claims 16 and 20 because of informalities; and 2) rejected claims 1-13, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-31 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rothermel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,827, hereinafter "Rothermel") and Teng (U.S. Pat. No. 7,380,008, hereinafter "Teng").

With this Response, Applicant has amended claim 1, 8, 16, 20, 22, and 31, and added claims 37-42.

I. OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

Claims 16 and 20 have been amended to depend from new claims 41 and 39. Applicant requests that the objections to claims 16 and 20 be withdrawn.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER § 103(a) OVER ROTHERMEL AND TENG

Independent claims 1, 8, 22, and 31 have been amended to remove limitations of claims 15, 19, 23, and 32 (and intervening claims) that the Examiner found allowable in the Final Office Action of April 16, 2008, but now deems unpatentable. New claims 37-42 recite the limitations of previously cancelled claims 15, 19, 23, and 32 (and intervening claims) (i.e., limitations removed from amended independent claims 1, 8, 22, and 31).

Claim 1 requires "expanding at least one template at a central location to create a document comprising expanded information." Template expansion is well known to those skilled in the computer arts to refer to assigning values to variable fields of the template. The PTO interprets claim terms "as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 4, lines 20-67 as teaching the quoted limitations. Rothermel, column 4, lines 20-67 teaches a "security policy manager device to create a consistent security policy for multiple network security devices (NSDs) by distributing a copy of a security policy template to each of the NSDs and by then configuring each copy the template with NSD-specific information." Rothermel teaches that the template is distributed to the NSDs; and each copy distributed is then expanded (i.e., the

templates are expanded in the NSDs). Thus, while claim 1 requires centralized template expansion, Rothermel teaches distributed template expansion. Rothermel fails to teach or even suggest “expanding at least one template at a central location to create a document comprising expanded information” as required by claim 1. Teng fails to satisfy these deficiencies of Rothermel.

Claim 1 further requires “sending from the central location the document comprising the expanded information to said plurality of computing devices.” The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 4, line 49 through column 5, line 13 as teaching these limitations. That portion of Rothermel teaches a manager device defining a security policy template, sending a copy of the template to a supervisor device associated with the NSDs, the supervisor device sending a copy of the template to the NSDs, and then configuring the NSD template copies in the NSDs. Thus, Rothermel again teaches distribution of the template and local expansion in the NSDs. Rothermel fails to teach or even suggest “sending the document comprising the expanded information to said plurality of computing devices” as required by claim 1. Teng fails to satisfy these deficiencies of Rothermel. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

In the Final Office Action of April 16, 2008, the Examiner stated, “a careful reading of Rothermel shows that such is indeed taught at the passages cited.” Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify the extraction of such teaching as the cited text clearly teaches distribution of template copies to the NSDs, then configuring the NSD template copies with NSD-specific information. (Rothermel, column 4, lines 36-38, column 5, lines 2-4).

Claim 8 requires “a communications gateway through which communication messages are exchanged between said agents and said database system, wherein said communications gateway is configured to: retrieve individual ones of the plurality of templates; expand the retrieved templates to create respective documents containing combined template information and expanded information; and provide the documents containing

the combined template information and expanded information to said plurality of agents.” These limitations are similar to those of claim 1. The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 4 as in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8, and all claims depending therefrom are allowable for the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Claims 22 and 31 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22 and 31, and all claims respective depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3 and 9 require “the structure of said plurality of templates includes conditional statements that determine whether a template is to be expanded with predetermined information on the basis of the computing device to which the expanded information is being provided.” Claim 9 includes similar limitations. The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 4, lines 30-62 and Rothermel, column 5, lines 60-67 as teaching these limitations. Rothermel column 4 teaches “each template defines default network information filtering rules . . . and uses defined aliases.” Rothermel column 5 teaches encryption, hashing, passwords, etc. for protecting information. Neither location teaches the “conditional statements” of claim 3. Teng fails to satisfy these deficiencies of Rothermel. For at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 9 are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 4-6, 10-12, 27, and 33 require template categories that reflect policies applicable to all of the plurality, a sub-set of the plurality, or a particular type of the plurality of devices. The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 6, lines 20-32 as teaching these limitations. The cited text teaches different classes of devices and that “security policy templates and specific security policies can be viewed as defining levels of trust given to various specific devices or classes of devices.” Neither device classes nor defining trust levels are indicative of the template categories of claims 4-6, 10-12, 27, and 33. Teng fails to satisfy these deficiencies of Rothermel. For at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-6, 10-12, 27, and 33 are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 17 requires the “communications gateway expands a template to include information contained in a conditional statement only if the computing device to which said expanded information is to be provided meets the condition.” The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 11, lines 35-40 as teaching these limitations. The cited text teaches various information that may be included to configure an NSD (e.g., OOB information, route information , etc.). Expanding a template to include information in a conditional statement if the conditional statement is satisfied is not mentioned. For at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 21 and 26 includes limitations similar to claim 17. The Examiner cites Rothermel, column 11, lines 18-30 as teaching these limitations. The cited text teaches various information that may be included to configure an NSD (e.g., customer information, identification and access information, etc.). Expanding a template to include information in a conditional statement if the conditional statement is satisfied is not mentioned. For at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 25 requires “all of the users on said list perform a specified role relative to said computing devices.” The Examiner asserts no specific reference against these limitations stating only that the “claims are rejected on the same basis as are claims 1-14, 16-18, 20, and 21.” (Current Office Action, p. 7). None of the listed claims includes the limitations of claim 25. For at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable over the cited art.

Claim 28-30 and 34-36 include inheritance limitations. The Examiner asserts no specific reference against these limitations stating only that the “claims are rejected on the same basis as are claims 1-14, 16-18, 20, and 21. (Current Office Action, p. 7). None of the listed claims includes the limitations of claims 28-30 and 34-36. For at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28-30 and 34-36 are allowable over the cited art.

Appl. No. 09/852,244
Amdt. dated March 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of February 20, 2009

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons presented above, all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/David M. Wilson/

David M. Wilson
Reg. No. 56,790
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
Phone: (713) 238-8000
Fax: 238-8008
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400